

# County of Los Angeles CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012 (213) 974-1101 http://cao.co.la.ca.us

September 25, 2003

Board of Supervisors GLORIA MOLINA First District

YVONNE BRATHWAITE BURKE Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY Third District

DON KNINDE

DON KNABE Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH

Fifth District

To:

Supervisor Yvonne Brathwaite Burke, Chair

Supervisor Gloria Molina Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky Supervisor Don Knabe

Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From:

David E. Janssen

Chief Administrative Officer

# QUARTERLY REPORT ON COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA) ACTIVITY (THIRD QUARTER 2003)

In response to the increased level of CRA activity in the County and this office's augmented role in analyzing and scrutinizing these activities, we provided your Board with an initial "Quarterly Report on CRA Issues" on October 12, 2000. Attached is the latest Quarterly Report, covering activities during the first quarter of the calendar year. As we indicated in our initial report to your Board, and consistent with the Board-approved policies and procedures, this office works closely with the Auditor-Controller, County Counsel, and appropriate Board offices in: analyzing and negotiating proposals by redevelopment agencies to amend existing redevelopment agreements; reviewing proposed new projects for compliance with redevelopment law, particularly blight findings and determining appropriate County response; and ensuring appropriate administration of agreements and projects.

The attached report reflects a summary of the following activities during the quarter:

- Notifications provided to the Board regarding new projects;
- Board letters/actions; and
- Major ongoing issues and other matters, including litigation.

Please let me know if you have any questions, or your staff may contact Robert Moran or Jerry Ramirez at (213) 974-1130 or (213) 974-4282, respectively.

DEJ:LS MKZ:JR:nl

#### Attachment

c: Lloyd W. Pellman, County Counsel J. Tyler McCauley, Auditor-Controller

# COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA) ISSUES Quarterly Report – Third Quarter 2003 – October 1, 2003

#### New CRA Projects - Routine Notifications/Reports Provided to Board

| CRA Projects  | District | Type of Notification | Date Provided to<br>Board |
|---|----------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Hawthorne Project No. 2<br>(Hawthorne)<br>(See below)   | Second   | Preliminary Report   | July 22, 2003             |
| Amendment to Merged<br>Central Business and West<br>End Redevelopment Project<br>(Azusa)<br>(See below) | First    | Update               | August 27, 2003           |
| Neighborhood Preservation<br>Project<br>(Huntington Park)<br>(see below)                                | First    | Update               | July 2, 2003              |

# Board Letters/Actions During Quarter

| CRA Projects                        | District | Action                | Date of Board Action |
|-------------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Hawthorne Project No. 2 (Hawthorne) | Second   | Approval of Amendment | August 26, 2003      |

### Major Ongoing or Emergent CRA Issues

#### Azusa (First District)

Issue: CAO received the Preliminary Report for the Central Business District and West End Redevelopment Projects. After initial review and several site visits, CAO had initial concerns

regarding proposal to amend cap and inclusion of selected parcels. Project includes three County

parcels that require Board approval.

Status: CAO staff and the City have resolved the cap issue, avoiding negative fiscal impact on the County.

CAO submitted Statement of Objections regarding the inclusion of one parcel at their September 2, 2003 public hearing. Despite our objections, City adopted redevelopment project with parcel of concern included; however, the CAO did not recommend any further action. After final action from

City, Board must approve agreement amending cap and redevelopment plan for County parcels.

# Hawthorne (Second District)

Issue: The Agency proposed an Amendment to add two parcels to an existing project area. The parcels

are currently owned by the Los Angeles Air Force Base and are in the City of El Segundo, one of the parcels will be annexed to the City of Hawthorne. In exchange for modernizing and consolidating the Air Force Base on one of the parcels, the developer will acquire the other parcel for a new residential development project. By undertaking this modernization, the Base will

hopefully avoid being included in the next round of base closures.

Status: The City of Hawthorne asked the County to contribute their share of the pass-through to help close

Air Force Base proposal funding gap. On August 26, 2003, the Board approved CRA agreement

amendment to commit County pass-through to assist in the Air Force Project.

#### **Huntington Park (First District)**

CAO received the Preliminary Report for the Neighborhood Preservation Redevelopment Project. Issue:

After several site visits and meetings with City staff, CAO had initial concerns regarding consistency with Community Redevelopment Law. Agency staff agreed to recommend to the Redevelopment

Agency Board that they revise their redevelopment project to resolve County's concerns.

On July 7, 2003, the City of Huntington Park adopted the Neighborhood Preservation Status:

Redevelopment Project with CAO recommended changes.

#### Litigation

### Los Angeles - Chinatown (First District)

Agency proposed to amend the Chinatown project by increasing the lifetime cap and extending time Issue:

limits. Clause in the 1980 Tax Allocation Agreement requires the Agency to "negotiate in good

faith" with the County regarding any amendments.

Despite County objections, including inadequacy of plan, lack of an updated EIR, and breach of Status:

contract, the City adopted the project. The Board authorized legal action, and a lawsuit was filed. The City prevailed on the adequacy of plan and EIR issues. The portion of the case regarding

breach of contract has been litigated and a decision is expected soon.

#### Los Angeles - City Center (First and Second Districts)

Issue: Agency adopted the City Center Redevelopment Project on May 15, 2002. This project of

approximately 880 acres in Downtown Los Angeles reestablishes as a new project much of the existing Central Business District (CBD) Project, which has reached its court-validated project cap.

The County filed a lawsuit objecting to the Project on the basis that it violates the court-validated Status: project cap on the CBD Project, and improperly includes 30 acres of non-blighted parking lots surrounding the Staples Center. The trial judge issued a final decision invalidating the project. The judge's decision cites the court-validated project cap and the inconsistency of permitting the City to

evade the effect of that limitation. The City has appealed the decision.

#### Los Angeles - Central Industrial (First and Second Districts)

The City adopted the Central Industrial Redevelopment Project on November 15, 2002. The project Issue:

includes approximately 744 acres of primarily industrial areas located in the southeast section of Downtown Los Angeles, Similar to the City Center Project, the Central Industrial Project includes

detachment of parcels from the CBD Project.

Similar to City Center, County filed lawsuit objecting to the Project on the basis that it violates the Status:

court-validated project cap on the CBD project. The trial was held on September 18, 2003. We are

awaiting a decision.

#### Legislation

#### SB 465

This Bill would declare that local government would be able to establish Transit Village Issue: Redevelopment Areas centered on a rail transit station that would create new "blight" criteria,

loosen existing redevelopment limits, and exempt pass-through obligations to taxing entities.

# CRA Quarterly Report – Second Quarter 2003 Page 3

Status:

On May 29, 2003, this bill was held in committee and is under submission. This bill is dead since it has not moved out of the house of origin; however, there is the possibility of the bill resurfacing if a rule waiver is granted. We will continue to monitor this bill.

#### AB 1235

Issue:

This bill would establish a procedure to allocate a portion of property tax revenue of a dissolved redevelopment agency to school entities.

Status:

On March 17, 2003, this bill was sent to committee. This bill is dead since it has not moved out of the house of origin; however, there is the possibility of the bill resurfacing if a rule waiver is granted. We will continue to monitor this bill.

#### AB 1755/SB 1045

Issue:

This bill in the budget package requires a one-time transfer of \$135 million in property tax from redevelopment agencies to the Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) in 2003-04. This bill contains CRA-requested language that gives agencies flexibility in how the payments are made and authorization to amend redevelopment plans to add one year for the plan's period of effectiveness and for repayment of indebtedness. This additional year of tax increment flowing to redevelopment agencies would be a diversion from the taxing entities and would allow agencies to access additional property tax revenues far in excess of the amount shifted to ERAF.

Status:

CAO, IGR, and County Council are exploring legislative options to lessen impact on counties.

#### Overall CRA Statistics

Active CRA Projects 294 Pending CRA Projects 30